Postal Regulatory Commission Submitted 1/3/2012 11:46:16 AM Filing ID: 79250 Accepted 1/3/2012

Before the POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, DC 20268-0001

Redfield Post Office Redfield, New York Docket No. A2011-86

PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO POSTAL SERVICE NOTICE

(January 3, 2012)

The Public Representative hereby provides supplemental comments in response to the Postal Service's Notice of December 16, 2011, clarifying the Administrative Record concerning its proposal to close the Redfield, NY Post Office.¹ These comments supplement the Reply Brief of the Public Representative filed on December 5, 2011.²

The Postal Service's Notice provides legible copies of Item No. 36, pages 1-5, of Administrative Record showing the round date-stamped cover page of the Proposal to Close the Redfield, NY Post Office and Extend Service by Rural Route Service (Proposal).³ The round date-stamped copies of the Proposal cover page indicate that the Proposal was posted at both the Redfield and Williamstown post offices on June 3, 2011.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS

The Public Representative welcomes the Postal Service's clarification of the Administrative Record. The Administrative Record filed with the Commission lacked legible copies of the round date-stamped Proposal that accompanied the Postal Service's Notice.⁴

¹ United States Post Service Notice of Filing, Docket No. A2011-86, December 16, 201 (Notice).

² Reply Brief of the Public Representative, Docket No. A2011-86, December 5, 2011 (Reply Brief).

³ Id. at 3-7, which show Administrative Record (AR) Item No. 36, pages 1-5.

⁴ United States Post Service Notice of Filing, Docket No. A2011-86, October 11, 2011, which informed the Commission of the Postal Service's filing of the "electronic version of the administrative record concerning the Final Determination to Close the Redfield, NY Post Office and Extend Service by Rural Route Service." *Id.* at 1.

In the Final Determination to Close the Redfield, NY Post Office and Extend Service by Rural Route Service, the Postal Service claimed that the Proposal was posted at the Redfield *and* Williamstown post offices.⁵ In reviewing the Administrative Record filed with the Commission, however, the Public Representative could find no evidence to support the Postal Service's claim, and therefore asserted that the Administrative Record is "devoid of evidence that the Proposal was posted at the Williamstown Post Office."

The Postal Service's Notice confirms that the Proposal was properly posted at both the Redfield and Williamstown post offices. Nevertheless, the conclusions of the Reply Brief remain unchanged, *i.e.*, the Final Determination to close the Redfield Post Office should be remanded. Reply Brief at 6. The Postal Service has failed to consider the effect on the community of parking safety at the Williamstown Post Office. *Id.* at 7-9. Nor has the Postal Service sufficiently considered the effect on employees and the calculation of economic savings of closing the Redfield Post Office. *Id.* at 9-11. For these reasons the Commission should remand the Postal Service's Final Determination to close the Redfield Post Office.

Respectfully submitted,

James F. Callow Public Representative

901 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20268-0001 (202) 789-6839; Fax (202) 789-6891 callowjf@prc.gov

⁶ Reply Brief at 7; see also http://www.prc.gov/Docs/76/76595/2011%2010-11%20Administrative%20Record.pdf.

⁵ AR Item No. 47 at 2.